

REMARKS

The present Amendment is in response to the Examiner's Restriction mailed October 1, 2003. Claim 26 is cancelled, and claims 1, 13-14, 22 and 40 are amended. Claims 1-25 and 27-46 are now pending in view of the above amendments. The Examiner has required restriction between two inventions: (I) claims 1-26 and 40-46, drawn to an integrated component mounting system, classified in class 29, subclass 739; and (II) claims 27-39, drawn to an X-ray tube device, classified in class 378, subclass 144.

Restriction was required because the Examiner believed that the inventions are distinct, based on the following reasons: Inventions I and II are related as apparatus and product made. The inventions in this relationship are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the apparatus as claimed is not an obvious apparatus for making the product and the apparatus can be used for making a different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different apparatus (MPEP § 806.05(g)). In this regard, the Examiner noted that "the apparatus, as claimed in Group I, is not an obvious apparatus for making the product II and the apparatus can be used for making a different electronic assembly other than the x-ray tube as claimed in Group II such as wherein a component being pressure welded to the shaft without the use of a threaded nut thereof, etc."

By way of this response, Applicant has amended the claims included in Group I to overcome the Examiner's concerns as stated in the office action. In particular, independent claims 1, 14 and 40 have each been amended to be directed to "an integrated component mounting system for use in an x-ray tube." Moreover, each claim now requires that the presence of an "x-ray tube component" that is disposed on a shaft (claims 1 and 40) or an "x-ray tube target anode" as the component (claim 14). The amendment of these independent

claims 1, 14 and 40 addresses the examiner's concerns as stated in the office action, as well as to the claims depending therefrom. In view of the amendment, it is respectfully requested that the restriction requirement as to claims 1-26 and 40-46 be withdrawn, and each of the claims presently pending in this application be examined.

In the Office Action, the Examiner required that the applicant make an election to a identified species in the event that there was an election of Group I above. Insofar as Applicant has elected Group II, with traverse, it is believed that no election of species is required at this time, in that it is believed that it was implicitly acknowledged that independent claim 27 is generic to each of the disclosed species.

CONCLUSION

In light of the Amendments and the arguments set forth above, Applicants earnestly believe that they are entitled to a letters patent, and respectfully solicit the Examiner to expedite prosecution of this patent application to issuance. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 31, 2003

By: Eric Maschoff

ERIC L. MASCHOFF
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 36,596
Customer No. 022913